

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action dated September 20, 2005.

Claims 1-2, 7-9, and 12-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lorimer, EP 0724371 A1. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to provide, in part, for, “[a] cell search method for use in a mobile radio terminal adaptable to a predetermined number N of kinds of mobile telephone systems, where N is an integer not less than 1, the method comprising the steps of ... carrying out cell search for a high-priority mobile telephone system at first regular intervals when the mobile radio terminal is in a standby state in a low-priority mobile telephone system, ... and, in a case where a cell of the high-priority mobile telephone system cannot be detected by the cell search for the high-priority mobile telephone system following the transmission-related operation, the cell search for the high-priority mobile telephone system is repeated at second regular intervals, ... each of the second regular intervals being of shorter time duration than each of the first regular intervals.” Independent claim 9 has been amended to provide, in part, for, “[a] mobile radio terminal adaptable to a predetermined number N of kinds of mobile telephone systems, where N is an integer not less than 1, said mobile radio terminal comprising ... means for carrying out cell search for a high-priority mobile telephone system: (1) at first regular intervals when the mobile radio terminal is in a standby state in a low-priority mobile telephone system, ... and (3) when a cell of the high-priority mobile telephone system cannot be detected by the cell search for the high-priority mobile telephone system following the transmission-related operation, the cell search for the high-priority mobile telephone system is repeated at second regular intervals, ... each of the second regular intervals being of shorter time duration than each of the first regular intervals.” Antecedent basis for the amendments to independent claims 1 and 9 is found in the specification on page 9, line 4, to page 10, line 2, and in the drawings in Fig. 5.

In the Office Action, the Examiner admits that, “Lorimer does not mention carrying out cell search for a high-priority mobile telephone system at regular intervals when the mobile radio terminal is in a standby state in a low-priority mobile telephone system,” (Office Action, page 3, lines 3-5), but states that, “[o]fficial notice is taken that carrying out cell search for a high-priority mobile telephone system at regular intervals when the mobile radio terminal is in a

standby state in a low-priority mobile telephone system is well known in the art (as disclosed by Rajaniemi et al. U.S. 6,487,399; col. 1, lines 32-38),” (Office Action, page 3, lines 5-8).

However, neither Rajaniemi et al. nor Lorimer nor a combination of the two disclose, teach, or suggest the features of carrying out a cell search for a high-priority mobile telephone system at first regular intervals, when the mobile radio terminal is in a standby state in a low-priority mobile telephone system, and, when a cell of the high-priority mobile telephone system cannot be detected by a cell search for the high-priority mobile telephone system following a transmission-related operation, the cell search for the high-priority mobile telephone system is repeated at second regular intervals, each of the second regular intervals being of shorter time duration than each of the first regular intervals, as claimed in independent claims 1 and 9.

Since claims 2, 7-8, and 12-13 are directly dependent upon one of independent claims 1 and 9, they are allowable over Lorimer for the same reasons recited above with respect to the allowability of independent claims 1 and 9 over Lorimer.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable of Lorimer in view of Ogawa, U.S. Patent No. 5,991,644. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

With regard to Lorimer, claim 3 is allowable over Lorimer for the same reasons recited above with respect to the allowability of independent claim 1 over Lorimer since claim 3 is directly dependent upon independent claim 1. With regard to Ogawa, Ogawa deals with a folding portable communication device, but does not disclose, teach, or suggest anything about cell searches for a high-priority mobile telephone system when a mobile radio terminal is in a low-priority mobile telephone system, as claimed in independent claim 1.

Claims 4 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lorimer in view of Lim et al., U.S. Publication No. 2003/0117996 A1. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

With regard to Lorimer, since claims 4 and 10 are directly dependent upon independent claims 1 and 9, respectively, they are allowable over Lorimer for the same reasons recited above with respect to the allowability of independent claims 1 and 9 over Lorimer. With regard to Lim et al., the Examiner alleges that, “Lim et al. disclose cell search for the high-priority mobile telephone system is repeated in a short search cycle for a predetermined period of time (see par.

0029),” (Office Action, page 4, paragraph 4, lines 7-8). However, Lim et al. only discloses cell search, based upon cells with signal strengths greater than a threshold, (paragraphs [0012], [0025], [0029]), but does not disclose, teach, or suggest cell searches for a high-priority mobile telephone system at first regular intervals when the mobile radio terminal is in a standby state in a low-priority mobile telephone system, and at second regular intervals following a transmission-related operation, each of the second regular intervals being of shorter time duration than each of the first regular intervals, as claimed in independent claims 1 and 9, and, thus, in dependent claims 4 and 10.

Claims 5 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lorimer in view of Shoji et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0041580 A1. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Since claims 5 and 11 are directly dependent upon independent claims 1 and 9, respectively, they are allowable over Lorimer for the same reasons recited above with respect to the allowability of independent claims 1 and 9 over Lorimer. With regard to Shoji et al., the Examiner alleges that Shoji et al. discloses “in case where a cell of the high-priority mobile telephone system can not be detected by the cell search for the high-priority mobile telephone system following the transmission-related operation, the cell search for the high-priority mobile telephone system is repeated in a short search cycle a predetermined number of times (see par. 0068),” (Office Action, page 5, paragraph 5, lines 7-11).

However, Applicant respectfully disagrees that Shoji et al. discloses anything about repeated search for a cell of a high-priority mobile telephone system upon failure to detect such a cell following a transmission-related operation. On the contrary, Shoji et al. only speaks about a cell search in a W-CDMA system to identify a scrambled code number at a mobile station, (paragraph [0004]). Paragraph [0068] only speaks about repeating the cell searches as many times as the number of path positions detected. Furthermore, Shoji et al. does not disclose anything about a cell search for a high-priority mobile telephone system being at first regular intervals when the mobile radio terminal is in a standby state in a low-priority mobile telephone system, and conducting such a cell search for a high-priority mobile telephone system at second regular intervals where a cell of the high-priority mobile telephone system cannot be detected by

a cell search following a transmission-related operation, each of the second regular intervals being of a shorter time duration than each of the first regular intervals, as claimed in independent claims 1 and 9 and, therefore, in dependent claims 5 and 11.

Claim 6 was objected to, as mentioned in the previous Office Action, which stated that claim 6 was objected as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but which stated that claim 6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Claim 14 was allowed, as mentioned in the previous Office Action.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, allowance of claims 1-14 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims as amended and pass this case to issue.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on December 5, 2005:

Max Moskowitz

Name of applicant, assignee or
Registered Representative

Signature

December 5, 2005

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

Max Moskowitz

Registration No.: 30,576

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700